

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claim Amendments

The Applicant has amended claims 1, 7 and 11. Applicant respectfully submits no new matter has been added. Accordingly, claims 1-4 and 7-17 are pending in the application. Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Response

The Examiner argues that the claims of the present invention are not limited to one identifier as long as there exists at least one identifier shared between networks. However, the fourth element of claim 1 states "...requesting by the second network from the first network an identifier that has been generated and used by the first network to identify the user towards the entity that provides the application,...". First, the language of the claim specifically sets apart the one identifier of the user (the one that has been generated by the first network for the user). Second, the one identifier is used by the first network to admit/identify the user to the application entity; so the first network certifies to the identifier's reliability. Third, the second network requests the specific user identifier (generated by the first network) from the first network so as to admit the user to the application via the second network.

The Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's characterization of the Applicant's identifier. There is only one identifier and it is characterized as having been generated by the first network and also used by the first network to identify the user. The Applicant respectfully submits that there is no way to interpret the identifier "generated by the first network" (a specific, single identifier) as being more than one identifier as disclosed in the Anton reference.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a)

Claims 1-4 and 7-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anton et al (US Patent 7,185,360) in view of Inoue, et al. (US Patent 6,163,843). The only reason Applicant has amended claims 1, 7 and 11 (changing 'and'

to 'or') to clarify the intent of the Applicant to show that access to an application is gained through one network or the other and not subsequent networks. The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of these claims.

The Applicant respectfully submits that Anton does not disclose an authentication network; Anton discloses an authentication server and only one network 129. The authentication server 137 / gatekeeper server 135 is not a network in the technical sense (a plurality of connected nodes). Even if authentication server 137 could be regarded as a second network, it is claimed that the entity/application is accessed through the first network or through the second network but not through both of them in sequence. Receiving EF2 from the network 129 by the authentication server 137 / gatekeeper 135 and sending EF2 back to the network 129 indicates that the user accesses the application through the authentication server 137 and the network 129.

The Applicant's claims refer to application access via one or the other networks (network, in the technical sense). The purpose of the present invention is to reduce the identification process by using an identifier that has already proved reliable by one network and can be used by a subsequent network that trusts the identifier generated by the first network. Authentication servers would be included in both, separate networks (though not shown) in the present invention. This being the case, normally the user would have to be authenticated again in the second network. As previously stated, the present invention obviates this necessity.

Also, the Examiner states that EF1 is created by the mobile terminal. Respectfully, EF1 is disclosed by Anton as being provided by the authentication server; i.e., "...client device ID keyword EF1 provided by the authentication web server 137." (col 9, lines 37-41, Fig. 8) Neither Anton nor Inoue shows a shared identifier nor a plurality of identifiers having such a shared identifier. Further, neither Anton nor Inoue disclose using a shared (the same) identifier to access an application via one network or the other.

As provided in MPEP § 2143, "[t]o establish a prima facie case of obviousness, ... the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations." In that regard, the Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner's

two references still fail to teach or suggest each and every element of the presently pending independent claims whether considered individually or in combination. The Applicant submits that independent claim 1 and analogous claims 7 and 11 are therefore not obvious. The Applicant respectfully requests the allowance of claims 1, 7 and 11.

Claims 2-4, 7-10 and 12-17 depend respectively from amended claims 1, 7 and 11 and recite further limitations in combination with the novel elements of claims 1, 7 and 11. Therefore, the allowance of claims 2-4, 7-10 and 12-17 is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, the Applicant believes all of the claims currently pending in the Application to be in a condition for allowance. The Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw all rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance for all pending claims.

The Applicant requests a telephonic interview if the Examiner has any questions or requires any additional information that would further or expedite the prosecution of the Application.

Respectfully submitted,

/Sidney L. Weatherford, Reg No 45,602/
By Sidney L. Weatherford
Registration No. 45,602

Date: April 2, 2010

Ericsson Inc.
6300 Legacy Drive, M/S EVR 1-C-11
Plano, Texas 75024

(972) 583-8656
sidney.weatherford@ericsson.com